

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

I ^A	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
7	09/851,868	05/09/2001	Stanley W. Stephenson	82633RLO	4959
γ"	7590 12/17/2003			EXAMI	NER
	Thomas H. Close			LIU, MING HUN	
	Patent Legal S Eastman kodal			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	343 State Street Rochester, NY 14650-2201			2675	
				DATE MAILED: 12/17/2003	9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No. Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	09/851,868	STEPHENSON ET	AL.			
, and the second	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Ming-Hun Liu	2675				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	iress			
THE REPLY FILED 11/20/2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper repl n places the applica	y to a ation in			
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final reject	ion.			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	f extension and the corresponding amo he shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The app originally set in the final	ropriate extension Office action; or			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) X they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);				
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or si	mplifying the			
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim	s.			
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment			
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NO	T place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which wer	e newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: 1-10.						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b) disapproved by the	he Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer						
10. Other:	The					
	STEVEN SARAS					
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER						
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600						





Continuation of 2. NOTE: The amended claim 1 alters the scope of the claim wherein a new search maybe requried to determine the patentablity of the claimed invention.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to the proposed amendment, by removing "selecting one of the first and second fixed voltages" the claim appears to bringt forth a new 35 USC § 112second paragraph issue where "the selected fixed voltage" has insufficient antecedent basis.

In response to the arguments, the claim even after the amendment does not place the application in condition for allowance. In response to the argument that Morich fails to include a "switching means" is incorrect. Morich teaches a controller that chooses the necessary voltage functions, a controller that acts as the switching means (column 2,lines 23-25). In reference to the argument that Morich's invention lacks a voltage divider, refer to column 13, lines 13-16 where Morich uses a capacitive voltage divider. The claim never limited the division method to a resistive division.